

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly warranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

26

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

MAR 01 2005
Date:

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

PETITION: Application for Status as a Temporary Resident pursuant to Section 210 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1160

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. If your appeal was sustained, or if the matter was remanded for further action, you will be contacted. If your appeal was dismissed, you no longer have a case pending before this office, and you are not entitled to file a motion to reopen or reconsider your case.

Robert P. Wiemann

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for temporary resident status as a special agricultural worker was denied by the Director, Western Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because the applicant failed to establish the performance of at least 90 man-days of qualifying agricultural employment during the eligibility period. This decision was based on adverse information acquired by the Service relating to the applicant's claim of employment for [REDACTED]

On appeal, the applicant reaffirms his claimed employment in agriculture. The applicant requested a copy of his file through the Freedom of Information Act. The director complied with the request on November 27, 2002.

In order to be eligible for temporary resident status as a special agricultural worker, an alien must have engaged in qualifying agricultural employment for at least 90 man-days during the twelve-month period ending May 1, 1986, and must be otherwise admissible under section 210(c) of the Act and not ineligible under 8 C.F.R. 210.3(d). 8 C.F.R. 210.3(a). An applicant has the burden of proving the above by a preponderance of the evidence. 8 C.F.R. 210.3(b).

On the Form I-700 application, the applicant claimed 118 man-days of qualifying agricultural employment for farm labor contractor [REDACTED] from October 1985 to May 1986.

In support of his claim, the applicant submitted a corresponding Form I-705 affidavit and a separate employment statement, both signed by [REDACTED]. In addition, the applicant submitted a 1988 pay stub and an envelope addressed to the applicant in the United States postmarked March 22, 1988.

In the course of attempting to verify the applicant's claimed employment, the Service acquired information which contradicted the applicant's claim. On January 22, 1990, in the presence of Service officers, [REDACTED] admitted in a signed, sworn statement that all of the employment documents signed by him were fraudulent.

On March 21, 1991, the Service advised the applicant in writing of the adverse information obtained by the Service, and of the Service's intent to deny the application. The notice was returned to the director undelivered. It is noted that that the applicant was provided with a copy of the notice on November 27, 2002.

The director determined that the applicant had failed to overcome the adverse evidence, and denied the application on May 23, 1991. On appeal, the applicant reaffirms his claimed employment in agriculture. The applicant did not submit any additional evidence on appeal.

Generally, the inference to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the extent of the documentation, its credibility, and amenability to verification. 8 C.F.R. 210.3(b)(1). Evidence submitted by an applicant will have its sufficiency judged according to its probative value and credibility. 8 C.F.R. 210.3(b)(2). Personal testimony by an applicant which is not corroborated, in whole or in part, by other credible evidence (including testimony by persons other than the applicant) will not serve to meet an applicant's burden of proof. 8 C.F.R. 210.3(b)(3).

There is no mandatory type of documentation required with respect to the applicant's burden of proof; however, the documentation must be credible. All documents submitted must have an appearance of reliability, i.e., if the documents appear to have been forged, or otherwise deceitfully created or obtained, the documents are not credible. United Farm Workers (AFL-CIO) v. INS, Civil No. S-87-1064-JFM (E.D. Cal.).

[REDACTED] admitted under oath that all employment documents which he prepared are fraudulent. The applicant has not overcome such derogatory evidence, which directly contradicts the applicant's claim. Therefore, the documentary evidence submitted by the applicant cannot be considered as having any probative value or evidentiary weight.

The applicant has failed to credibly establish the performance of at least 90 man-days of qualifying agricultural employment during the twelve-month statutory period ending May 1, 1986. Consequently, the applicant is ineligible for adjustment to temporary resident status as a special agricultural worker.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.